

## THE ORIGIN OF NATIONALITY IN OATHS, OBEDIENCE, ALLEGIANCE & ACTION

What is the root of national allegiance?  
Is it found in law, or in natural bonds?

There is a peculiar school of thought that dogmatically believes that the founding fathers placed far more importance on the place one's mother birthed them than the environment in which they are raised, and the relationships into which they are born, and which form the familial protective and associative sphere in which one's position and connections in life are formed.

This issue is more than simply a matter of curiosity since it is at the heart of the greatest conflict in the history of the presidency. I speak of the issue of whether or not an elected president is even qualified to serve. More specifically, whether Barack Obama is constitutionally qualified.

To understand the origin of our concepts of citizenship, it is necessary to travel back in time. Not just a decade or a century, but millennia. Back to times when national relationships were as clear as family relationships because there was a situation of them-or-us, and "us" was clearly understood since "them" were foreign invaders bent on conquest, killing, execution, and enslavement.

Nothing focuses the mind like a life-or-death situation that makes it clear who one's friends, allies, companions, and compatriots are. They are the natural members of one's nation, and they are in the crosshairs of people categorically different, and with no sympathy for any but their own.

How do you securely counter them when some of them are living among you? The United States asked itself that question in 1942 regarding the Japanese, (as well as German, and Italian citizens) of the United States. Unfortunately, in that case the authorities were lied to by a bigot general who wanted them all rounded-up and contained. But what about the situation of single individuals and whether or not authorities can trust them?

That is the question when it comes to potential spies. Our American spy-detection was a total failure when it came to our nuclear secrets during WW II, as Ameri-

cans & Brits willingly served as spies for Russia, giving them most of our most classified nuclear bomb designs and secrets.

But what about in general; what principle should a government follow to avoid such betrayal? Well, besides screening for radical ideology, they could theoretically screen for national loyalty, by setting baited traps and seeing if a person bites. If they do, and seek to exploit their "find", by selling it to the enemy, that would be evidence that they were never really loyal, never really held any allegiance to their country, and never felt they were under the constraint of obedience to the power and authority lawfully serving over them.

Either one is wired by their life-long acculturation to respect authority and view it as empowered for the purposes of protection, justice, and securing peace & security, or one is acculturated to view it as indifferent, unjust, illegitimate, corrupt and possibly even criminal.

Those in positions of authority over others cannot know how a person thinks or feels, nor what their motivations or grievances might be. Such inner attitudes are invisible behind an opaque exterior, -as was the case with the Boston Bombers.

Should we have known that they were different from us in the core of their consciousness? Well, we shouldn't have known if we couldn't have known. Is there any way that we could have known?

For this discussion, that is not the question. The question is whether or not there is a general principle that we can follow, -that we can turn to in order to form judgments about who we should be able to trust, and who we cannot be assured that we can trust.

That general principle exists but it is not found in the sphere of legal authority. Rather, the principle is found in the sphere of rational thought, common sense, and natural relationships.

To understand the beginning of nations, one must go back to before the beginning, to a time when there was no king, no government, no absolute Lord &

sovereign. Instead there were powerful warlords who each had conquered or inherited his own settled territory. They either exercised restraint among themselves or they became enemies and engaged in hostilities.

But any friction between them was put aside when the entire country was under threat of foreign enemy invasion. Then they had to band together in a common united effort to survive and not be slaughtered or enslaved. They would already have everything that they needed except for more volunteers to fight, and one true lord under whose banner they could all rally and attack.

A King was needed, and like Arthur, one was chosen. Then the warlords faced a huge hurdle they needed to get over, and that was the big surrender of their independent sovereignty over the actions of their own armies which would have to be given over to the new king via a gesture of total submission to him. They had to stop being absolute kings within their own domain, and be sub-sovereigns who must be to the king what their men were to them. They must be more like the Knights of the Round Table who obeyed Arthur their king.

His Knights were the Obedient. the Surrendered. the Loyal, Faithful & True. The discipline of all members of his loyal forces was essential. There must not be unpunished disobedience. To make men accountable for their disobedience, they were required to swear an oath before God and Man that they would be obedient, faithful and true to their lord and master, the King, and to those who serve under him.

Their oath required not only obedience but also loyalty. One might, -by being obedient but not loyal, overlook a plot of mutiny or treason. That would be a devastating failure of loyalty. And so they were sworn to be bonded to their one and only earthly lord and sovereign for life.

Their obedience must be absolute. And their allegiance must also be total. After that swearing of obedience and allegiance, they were in a new national dynamic which changed all the relationships which preceded it. They were from the taking of the solemn vow, wedded to the monarch, -with his reign never unquestioned. He became their head and they became his body, belonging to him and his authority

and power to united them, lead them, and extend the umbrella of his protection over them and their lands.

Like the oath of obedience that the archbishops take to the newly elected pope, prostrate on their faces, -their obedience was unquestioning obedience, and it was into that obedience that their children would come to be born. They would enter the world under the sworn obedience of their father, -born into it, born as subjects of the king, and natural subjects at that because they were born to bonded servants of the king, -in contrast to those who were subjects of a foreign sovereign but had made their home under the King's dominion.

Their children were not born into that obedience, that loyalty, that allegiance and so they were not viewed as being natural subjects but as being alien-born subjects. That was the nature of reality and the consequence was that those alien-born children who grew up as subjects of the king had a cloud of uncertainty always hanging over their head when it came to positions of national security.

A hypothetical may serve to illustrate. Suppose you were king, and had no sons, but only daughters. Suppose one of them was your own blood daughter and the other was the daughter of a foreign king with whom your nation was not very friendly, and whom you had adopted when she was about 12 years old as a gesture of peace.

Suppose you possessed a doomsday bomb that was large enough to destroy an entire city. To which daughter would you entrust on your death bed the combination needed to detonate that weapon? Your own flesh & blood? Or the off-spring of a foreign stranger, one raised in your own home as one of you, but who was different by birth and foreign association?

Hypothetical #2. Suppose you and your wife had to leave town for a week or two and were forced to leave your children at home. Who would you entrust their care to? Your own niece or the daughter of a strange family that moved in down the street about whom you know nothing?

They are the same age, go to the same school, speak the same language, watch the same movies. But does that mean she can totally be trusted with the care of your children?

What devotion, bond, or responsibility does she have toward you and yours? The same question can be asked of the children of foreigners. Are they tied to us by a bond and oath of obedience, loyalty, and allegiance?

Not at all, unless their parents have become Americanized by the oath of citizenship. Such parents are not passively part of us by merely being born and raised among us. They have personally taken positive action by preparing and taking the naturalization Oath of Allegiance and Renunciation by which they absolutely and entirely renounce, reject, adjure, and abandon the bond of obedience, loyalty and all allegiance and fidelity into which they were born.

They thereby utterly sever their inherited bond to their own King, Sovereign, Potentate, Czar, Emperor, Shah, Sultan, Maharajah, Chief, Caliphate or State. They divorce themselves from the Lord / nation that they were betrothed to from birth, and become wedded to a new nation of their own choosing. They surrender all to that relationship by swearing to bear arms to defend it, by swearing true faith and allegiance in its support.

They adopt a commitment to defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

The founding fathers were religious and moral men who through the long winter of war and tribulation were bonded together in a relationship of mutual trust. To them a sacred oath was a solemn vow that was made not just before men but before God, and if broken, though not punished in this life, would be punished at the Last Judgement when the Books of Life would be opened, and men would be judged by the Judge of the World base on the things written in them. That judgement would determine who would be thrown into the Lake of Fire.

So throughout the ages, to such leaders an oath meant far, far more than what it might mean to a juvenile, insincere alien who does not mean a word of it, as was the case with the younger of the Boston bombers.

To what does this all relate in America? It relates to the true meaning of the Civil Rights Act of 1866. And to what does that relate? To the citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment.

And to what does that relate? To the meaning of who is eligible to serve as President. The entire legal establishment of the United States has accepted an utterly false notion about what significance the Amendment plays in American citizenship.

They all consider the subject from inside a closed system, without any comprehension of the fact that the system's origin is outside of the system. It is in the realm of a natural open system. That means that its fundamental elements are not defined by closed system definitions. They in fact cannot be defined by law nor legal authority.

But worse, the authorities within the system have been ignorant for centuries as to the origins of the concepts on which their system is built.

They do not realize that fact though, because all of their certainty is rooted in the authority of words spoken or written by men from long ago who came to be seen as "experts", even though in the age in which they wrote, they were already too far removed from the origins of their system to understand its underlying foundational principles.

Instead, they relied on concepts invented to justify the reign of the monarch over his fellow Christians regardless of the facts that in Christ there is no king but Jesus, -no Christian armies, no priests nor priesthood, nor establishment of official religion, (-the kingdom of God being a spiritual Kingdom).

Those inside the system think they are masters of reality through their extensive knowledge base, but they are unaware that they are even *in* a system because it is the only reality that they know and can grasp. Any knowledge from outside the system is incomprehensible to them because it doesn't fit the definitions they've established to explain everything.

They don't and can't dwell on the unexplainable and unanswerable questions that exist inside the system and so they pretend that they don't exist.

That way they do not have to answer them. Einstein made that error and followed it throughout his long career, rejecting the implications of his own equations while believing until the 1930's that the Milky Way Galaxy was the entire Universe, eternal, unchanging, finite and closed.

Reality is not bounded by our finite concepts of reality but those inside the forest do not know that they are not seeing the big picture, but only a portion of it. And that is the problem regarding the legal mind-set today concerning the fundamentals of citizenship. They only see a small portion of the forest and have no grasp about the existence of the rest of it.

They falsely assume that their finite view of the meaning of the heart of the 14th Amendment's citizenship clause is the entire picture while ignoring the powerful evidence of their view being completely inaccurate.

The Amendment states with constitutional authority that "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside."

At least that's what their minds conclude that it says because they completely refuse to understand the meaning of the section that is missing above, -which is "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof".

The first part regarding place of birth is unambiguous, but the second part about being subject to the jurisdiction of the United States is an easily explained concept based on their closed system thinking.

They think they have the answers to the questions of what exactly is subjection, and who exactly is subject, and how are they subject, and what exactly does jurisdiction mean? They assert that those questions are pretty much answered by the writings of men who, in fact, didn't understand them at all.

Why would they place such confidence in such writings? Because they happened to have been part of the historical legal exploration in a Supreme Court opinion.

In the minds of the closed system adherents, any opinion issued by a 5-4 court is an infallible, papal-like wise and true and factual opinion, regardless of the fact that what they issue is never referred to as the

facts of the court but only as the opinion of the court. Since they are the ultimate legal authorities, it never occurs to their devotees that they might be wrong by one swing vote.

But they have often been wrong and sometimes by far less balanced votes. So if they were wrong about the meaning of the 14th Amendment, what were they wrong about? They were socially right as to their final opinion or ruling, but were wrong about many of the points that they used to arrive at it. That was because they, also, could not knowledgeable answer the questions that are posed above.

The court that made the fateful ruling did so 30 years after the amendment was ratified. In that time knowledge was lost as to what its words truly meant. But to be fair, they were already lost even to some of those who helped write and pass it.

The Civil Rights Act of 1866 stated that all persons born in the United States, and not subject to any foreign power, were citizens. That seems clear and straightforward. but soon after its passage, they changed the wording when authoring the 14th Amendment which would put its changes to American law above the authority of Congress to alter.

They switched it to referring to being subject to the jurisdiction of the United States instead of *not* being subject to a foreign power. One of the authors defined the meaning of the former by the latter.

That means that anyone born in the United States who is not subject to any foreign power (nor is an Indian not taxed, nor child of a foreign diplomat) is therefore subject to U.S. jurisdiction. That seems like a logical deduction, but doesn't answer the questions about what sort of subjection is referred to and what kind of jurisdiction is referred to.

Those who live inside the closed system never ask those questions because the answers don't come from within the system. That's because the answers are from antiquity and natural law, neither of which are known nor understood by the modern mind-set. They assert that American jurisdiction is merely American authority, but don't define what that

authority entails, nor do they, -nor *can* they, explain what being subject to it means. Those answers are lost to the sands of time. They aren't explained in any law, treatise, or Supreme Court opinion's explanatory background.

They exist suspended in mid-air by nothing because the authors choose to use constitutionally simple and elegant language rather than legalese language which avoids ambiguities and omissions. So we are stuck with a fundamental law that the entire legal establishment cannot accurately define. But it in fact is defined by the law that immediately preceded it. The Civil Rights Act of 1866.

It used language that was far less ambiguous and vague. Its words are understandable in the light of history. And those words explain the meaning, to a certain degree, of the 14th Amendment's words.

The children and descendants of imported slaves were not subject to any foreign power. They clearly were made citizens by it. But the humongous question then and now is, "What about the U.S. born children of foreigners and immigrants? Are they subject to a foreign power or not?"

The answer is found in antiquity. All subjects were bonded to their lord and King for life. So if they moved to another land, they were still the King's subjects. Or the Emperor's subjects. If you were Chinese and moved to and loved America and chose to become a citizen, the penalty for such a crime was beheading, along with the banishment to a great distance of all relatives, older and younger, including grandparents and grand children. The oath of Allegiance & Renunciation was an unforgivable insult to the dignity and sovereignty of the Emperor. The punishment was death.

After the Revolution, British immigrants who naturalized were still viewed in the eyes of the British government and monarch as being full-blood subjects of his majesty, and so the British stopped American ships and kidnapped and pressed into military service all persons who had been born British. That was the unacceptable situation that led to the little and powerless United States, with only three naval ships, declar-

ing War against the nation with the most powerful navy the world had ever seen.

## TO WHOM DO YOU BELONG?

Yourself? Or your government?

The right of expatriation is one of the most fundamental American rights of all, because without it, the Revolution itself would have been illegitimate. But, you belong to your country until you decide that you no longer wish to and choose to take positive steps to openly renounce your citizenship and take that of another.

That means that as long as foreign immigrants have not taken the oath of Allegiance & Renunciation, they remain as subjects or citizens of their homeland, and still subject to its jurisdiction, -which includes its military conscription authority.

But that creates a conflict and an ambiguity.

If you still owe allegiance to your foreign homeland, and perhaps some years of military service, and you owe obedience to your new homeland of the United States, and it wants you under its conscription authority, you are a conflicted and divided person because of dual subjection. To which nation are you naturally subordinate? The answer is both. One by birth and blood, and the other by adoption and residency. You have a schizophrenic nationality conundrum.

That is why such a situation was abhorrent to the founding fathers, who completely rejected the concept of dual allegiance. It was a form of allegiance bigamy or adultery.

You can be wedded to only one nation at a time. You can owe undivided, absolute loyalty to only one nation at a time.

You can swear to serve only one master at a time. You cannot be a DUAL CITIZEN! (circa 1776+)

But time and peace allayed fears of treason or disloyalty, and nations of Europe became democratic, so dual nationality came to be seen as tolerable since foreign countries were mostly unresistant to their citizens also being Americans, especially after we twice shed our blood for their liberty.

America standing alone as the sole beacon of Freedom and democracy were no longer the situation in

the modern world, so resistance to dual-citizenship faded away.

But meanwhile, the Constitution of the United States did not fade away nor change when it came to the qualifications to be President. It included a qualification not required of any other office and that was that the President must be a natural born citizen.

Gee, that sure sounds like it means he has to be 100% American. How could one be a natural American citizen if born to a foreigner? That would result in being born into his foreign allegiance, obedience, and loyalty. How could one be 100% different from their own father? And... how could the U.S. government trust them to be 100% different?

If your father is subject to the jurisdiction of his foreign homeland, how could you escape not being born into that same status, same inherited national membership, -same national obligation?

Well, you couldn't, unless you were born on Mars. On earth these days, one can travel half way around the world in just one day, not three months or more. So national bonds aren't significantly weakened until one obtains legal permanent residency. Then one can become a member of the society of a different nation, -put down new roots, make new friends and build new relationships, maybe even marry.

But the biggest determiner of one's tie to their homeland is the factor of age. Once you are too old, you cannot be drafted into the defense of the homeland and so its jurisdiction over you is then limited to things like taxes and pensions and banned terrorist associations.

But if you are female, then you will never in your life be subject to the authority that never included wives and daughters and mothers and sisters. Instead, you are members of the protected and exempted class. It is for you that the men fight to the death. They want you to be safe from harm, safe from rape, and safe from slavery. Those threats will make men go to the ends of the earth to defend against them.

They are subject to the devotion to and responsibility for your safety in this world. But that truth has been forgotten with the passage of the ages. Their

governments have the authority to require them to fulfill their obligation even if living in another land, because the males of the nation are born into that obligation, and their foreign-born sons are as well.

They would be "subject to a foreign power", and therefore would not be viewed by the American government as being under its jurisdiction, because it did not believe in nor accept dual-jurisdiction, nor dual subordination, nor dual allegiance. At least not until a Supreme Court decision in 1898 changed the rules of the game.

It reversed the policy of the United States government, which was openly defined in 1862 by Congress when it declared that foreigners and children born to them, including native-born children, -being subject to a foreign power, were exempt from military conscription to populate the U.S. Army for the civil war.

But ever since that pivotal Supreme Court ruling (U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark), the original rules have been forgotten and foreign immigrant fathers and their American born sons are viewed as being fully subject to America's authority to require the bearing of arms in defense of the nation if conscription is ever re-instituted.

So now immigrants can be subject to American authority and also subject to the authority of their foreign homeland. It's a Mad, Mad, schizophrenic nationality conflict conundrum.

How does this relate to you? It relates to the legitimacy of the President which has been allowed to occupy the White House contrary to the requirement of the U.S. Constitution. If even the Civil Rights Act denied citizenship for one born subject to a foreign power, then how could such a policy, tradition, philosophy have existed unless it was what had always existed and which from thenceforth would be formally mandated?

If one could successfully and logically persuade that it only referred to children of diplomats, then one could argue that no other foreigners were subject to the authority of their own government. But one cannot logically nor factually persuade that that was ever the case. Men remain subject wherever they go, at least until they are too old. Then they are no

longer a national asset when it comes to physically defending anything. How is this truth too hard to comprehend?

Well, it's not, but it is too hard to accept because that would mean that not only foreign diplomats are not subject to U.S. authority, but no foreigners are subject unless they are here to stay, officially recognized as having the authorization to be a member of American society by being issued a prized Green Card which allows them permanent residency and right to work.

If that is what makes them subject to U.S. jurisdiction, then those without a Green Card are not subject, and cannot be required to register with Selective Service, nor be drafted. That means all foreign tourists and visitors and students would be exempt from the obligations and subjection of citizens (and immigrants also).

There's a huge "but..." attached to that conclusion because the father of the President was just such a foreigner. And that would mean that he was not subject because he was not an immigrant. That would mean that his son was not born subject either since subjection flows through the head of the family, and within wedlock, that is the father, legally speaking.

That would mean that the 14th Amendment did not apply to his son through him and therefore his birth in the United States was irrelevant.

You could argue that his mother was subject to U.S. jurisdiction, but just try to explain what the heck that actually means by any historical reference. Women have not yet had the right to vote for a even century, nor the right for their children to inherit their nationality if fathered by an alien and born in the U.S. before the year 2000.

So whether or not one believes that Barack Obama is a 14th Amendment citizen or not, they cannot believe that he is a natural born citizen because such citizenship is not by law or government but by inheritance of a blood-transmitted kind of bond or connection.

Their citizenship exists outside of the system, unchangeable, untouchable by Congress, -beyond the right of men to legislate or regulate. It is citizenship

beyond all law, and cannot ever be revoked because there is no revoking what one naturally is, just as one's race or gender cannot be revoked.

Natural citizenship is organic citizenship, while law-dependent citizenship, or legal citizenship, is artificial government-produced adoption citizenship.

Natural citizenship and legal citizenship come from different universes, different spheres of reality. One comes from within the legal system and is its child. The other comes from outside of the legal system and is its father.

Legal citizenship is obtained by permission of government and its laws, and they are written by natural citizens who make room for enlarging the national family via adoption of new members and their children. But we do not give permission for their children to rule over us as one of us via the executive power of the office of President.

We reserve that power to only natural national family members because of the issue of loyalty to one's own, and not being able to know where the loyalty lies of one who is half of another world.

Hence; "No person except a natural born citizen,... shall be eligible to the office of the President,".

by Adrien Nash May 2013

<http://obama--nation.com>